

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California  
San Francisco Division

EDGAR PERRY,

No. C 13-02369 LB

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO FILE SECOND  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

v.

CASHCALL, INC., et al.,

[Re: ECF No. 76]

Defendants.

---

**INTRODUCTION**

On May 24, 2013, Plaintiff Edgar Perry, who is proceeding pro se, filed a Complaint against CashCall, Inc., and the United States Consumer Financial Protection Agency. *See* ECF No. 1.<sup>1</sup> Then, on July 28, 2013, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1), Perry filed a First Amended Complaint as a matter of course against CashCall, the Portuguese Fraternal Society of America, the First Bank of California, and the State of California. *See* ECF No. 18. All four Defendants have separately filed Motions to Dismiss Perry's First Amended Complaint. *See* CashCall Motion, ECF No. 25; First Bank of California Motion, ECF No. 32; Portuguese Fraternal Society of America Motion, ECF No. 37; State of California Motion, ECF No. 70. These Motions to

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations are to the Electronic Case File ("ECF") with pin cites to the electronically-generated page numbers at the top of the document.

1 Dismiss are pending and set for hearing on March 20, 2014.

2 Now, Plaintiff has filed a one-sentence Motion to File a Second Amended Complaint which  
3 states in full, “An[d] now comes the plaintiff and prays the court to file an amended Complaint.”  
4 *See* ECF No. 76. The standard for filing an amended complaint under Federal Rule of Civil  
5 Procedure 15 states that after a party has amended its pleading once as a matter of course, it “may  
6 amend its pleading only with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave. The court  
7 should freely give leave when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). Plaintiff’s motion does  
8 not meet the Rule 15(a) standard: it contains no argument or citations in support of it and otherwise  
9 fails to demonstrate any reason why justice requires that he be allowed to file a second amended  
10 complaint while Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss are pending. At this stage, the court will address  
11 the pending Motions to Dismiss first.

12 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion is **DENIED**. The Motion to Dismiss hearings will take place as  
13 scheduled on March 20, 2014 at 9:30 AM in Courtroom C, 15th Floor, United States District Court,  
14 450 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco 94102.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: February 20, 2014



17 LAUREL BEELER  
18 United States Magistrate Judge

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28